



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,051	04/03/2001	Kristopher P. Braud	017017620004	2009
27964	7590	09/26/2006	EXAMINER	
HITT GAINES P.C. P.O. BOX 832570 RICHARDSON, TX 75083			TO, BAOQUOC N	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2162		

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/825,051	BRAUD ET AL.
	Examiner Baoquoc N. To	Art Unit 2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/22/2006 has been entered.

Claims 1 and 21 are amended in the amendment filed on 08/22/2006 are pending in this application. Claims 1-52 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1 and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 recites "the data processing system" in lines 6-7 and 9 and there is no other "data processing system" excepting for "an enterprise data processing system" in lines 2-3. For the purpose of examination, "the data processing system" in lines 6-7 and 9, is "an enterprise data processing system" in lines 1-2.

Claim 21 recites "the data processing system" in lines 6-7 and 9 and there is not other "data processing system" recites in the claim excepting for "an enterprise data processing system" in line 4. For the purpose of examination, "the data processing system" in lines 67 and 9, is "an enterprise data processing system" in line 4.

Appropriate correction is required for independent claims 1, 20 and including all other dependents claims which direct or indirect depends on claims 1 and 20.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson et al. (US. Patent No. 6,112,183) in view of Halbritter et al. (US. Patent No. 7,022,017 B1).

With respect to claims 1 and 21 Swanson teaches a data processing system implemented method for managing data of an enterprise network that includes a plurality of ancillary system and an enterprise data processing system having an enterprise database, comprising:

receiving a request at the enterprise data processing system for a value of a data item (the client request) (col. 5, lines 5-10);

identifying an ancillary system of the plurality of ancillary system associated with the requested data item (the client stub 60 locates the appropriate server to handle the request) (col. 6, lines 38-46), wherein data for the value is stored in the ancillary system (request for col. 6, lines 20-25);

processing the data into the value for the data item (col. 6, lines 63-65); and
returning the requested value for the data item (the client stub 60 unpacks the output argument and returns them to the client application) (col. 6, lines 63-65).

Swanson does not explicitly teach determining whether accessing multiple entries of the data stored in the ancillary system is required before processing the data into the value; retrieving the data from the data processing system when determining accessing multiple entries is required; retrieving the data from the ancillary system when determining accessing multiple entries is not required. However, Swanson teaches “a server can make requests to other servers, making the process both a server and client process. Generally, client stubs 60 are responsible for locating a server to handle the request packing....” (col. 7, lines 1-14). In addition, Swanson also discloses “though the client request is generated in one computer system 12 or subsystem 26-50 and the requested information lies within another computer system 12 or subsystem 26-50...” (col. 5, lines 8-13). Lastly, Swanson discloses “for example, request 64 for member enrollment information may be made by program 54 in the benefit subsystem 30. The benefit subsystem 30 is the client the enrollment subsystem 26 processes benefit subsystem's 30 client request for member enrollment information and return the information to benefit subsystem 30 appended to server stubs 62” (col. 6, lines 21-31).

The above disclosure from Swanson explains to the issue of whether or not the to direct the request to the subsystem or to process the request at the receiving server (enterprise processing system) due to processing entries. On the other hand, Halbritter further discloses determining whether accessing multiple entries of the data stored in the ancillary system is required before processing the data into the value; retrieving the data from the data processing system when determining accessing multiple entries is required; retrieving the data from the ancillary system when determining accessing multiple entries is not required (as to after the player has browsed through the menus and entered his/her selections such that the player's request is complete (step 812), amenities server 104 processes the user's request (step 814). The processing steps differ depending on the type of hospitality report service selected by the player. For example, if the player placed a food and drink order, amenities server 104 preferably determines whether sufficient funds exist the player's service account, and if so, debits the player's services account and sends the order to service-client station 106c. Alternatively, if the player requested a transfer of funds between the player's services account and the player's gaming account, the amenities server 104 preferably interacts with transaction processor subsystem 104 to debit and credit the service and gaming accounts as requested... " (col. 13, lines 54-67 to column 14, lines 1-18). Halbritter further clearly discloses the concept of processing the request by amenities server 104 or the amenities server interact with the subsystem to perform debits and credit service and deliver the result back to client. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Swanson system

to include processing the request by amenities server 104 if possible or the amenities server interact with the subsystem to perform debits and credit service and delivery the result back to the client as taught by Halbritter in order to allow the main server to obtain the additional information to process the request.

As to claims 2, 22, and 42, Swanson further discloses identifying all data updated in the ancillary system since a last block transfer of data to the enterprise database; requesting a block transfer of updated data from the ancillary system; and copying the block of updated data to the enterprise database (col. 5, lines 1-5).

As to claims 3, 23, and 43, Swanson further discloses wherein processing the retrieved data into the value for the data item is performed subsequent to copying and prior to receiving the request (col. 7, lines 8-14).

As to claims 4, 24, and 44, Swanson further discloses wherein processing the retrieved data into the value further comprises aggregating the data into a value for the data item (col. 6, lines 5-10).

As to claims 5, 25, and 45, Swanson further discloses wherein the data stored in the ancillary system is more current than the data stored in the enterprise database (col. 8, lines 1-5).

As to claims 6, 26, and 46, Swanson further discloses the enterprise data processing system supports queries of the ancillary system (col. 4, lines 1-3); the ancillary system stores the data in relational database (col. 4, lines 1-3); the ancillary system stores the data in a database structure having a proprietary format (col. 4, lines 1-3); and a format of the data stored in the ancillary system (col. 4, lines 1-3).

As to claims 7, 27, and 47, Swanson further discloses attempting to contact the ancillary system (col. 5, lines 1-5); querying the ancillary system for the data (col. 5, lines 60-65); and receiving the data from the ancillary system (value) (col. 7, lines 5-14).

As to claims 8 and 28, Swanson further discloses attempting to contact the ancillary system based on the data stored in the ancillary system being accessible for real-time processing into the value (col. 5, lines 5-10); and receiving the data from the enterprise database based on the ancillary system being unresponsive, (col. 5, lines 5-10).

As to claims 9, 11, 29, and 31 recite similar limitations as discussed in claims 1 and 21; therefore, claims 9 and 29 are also rejected for the same reasons as given in claims 1 and 21.

As to claims 10 and 30, Swanson further discloses catching a message, wherein the message was generated by an ancillary system using a set of content rules and the message conforms to a message standard; opening the message; identifying the ancillary system based on the message, (col. 58, lines 38-42); accessing content conversion rules based on the identity of the ancillary system, (col. 48, lines 19-24); converting content from the message to enterprise information using the content conversion rules, (col. 48, lines 19-24); and storing the enterprise information in the enterprise database (col. 58, lines 27-28).

As to claims 12, 32, and 50, Swanson further discloses wherein the data item is a line item in a document (col. 7, lines 40-50).

As to claims 13 and 33, Swanson further discloses the enterprise database is updated with data from the ancillary system without employing automatic event trigger data transfer (col. 7, lines 8-14).

As to claims 14 and 34, Swanson further discloses calling a security model for requestor security information (col. 6, lines 54-55); receiving the requestor security information from the security model (col. 6, lines 54-55); and accessing a security key related to the requested data item based on the requestor security information (col. 6, lines 54-55).

As to claims 15 and 35, Swanson further discloses determining whether the data item relates to employee information or financial information; accessing management organizational information; and determining whether to return the requested data item value based on the requestor having access to the employee information (col. 8, lines 1-5).

As to claims 16 and 36, Swanson further discloses prior to calling a security model for requestor security information, determining whether the data item relates to employee information or financial information (col. 7, lines 31-37); and determining whether to return the requested data item value based on the security key (col. 7, lines 31-37).

As to claims 17 and 37, Swanson further discloses monitoring a clock for a predetermined time interval (col. 8, lines 1-5).

As to claims 18 and 38, Swanson further discloses receiving a second request for the value of a second data item (col. 6, lines 50-55); identifying an auxiliary datastore

associated with the second data item (col. 6, lines 50-55); and retrieving the value for the data item from the auxiliary datastore (col. 7, lines 5-15).

As to claims 19 and 39, Swanson further discloses identifying an ancillary system related to the auxiliary datastore (col. 5, lines 1-5); identifying all data updated in the ancillary system since a last block transfer of data to the auxiliary datastore (col. 5, lines 1-10); requesting a block transfer of updated data from the ancillary system (col. 5, lines 1-10); and copying the block: of updated data to the auxiliary datastore (col. 5, lines 1-10).

As to claims 20 and 40, recite similar limitations as discussed in claims 2, 22, and 42; therefore, claims 20 and 40 are also rejected for the same reasons as given in claims 2, 22, and 42.

With respect to claim 41 recites similar limitations as discussed in claims 1 and 2, Swanson also teaches ancillary system access rules (col. 7, lines 32-37).

As to claim 48, Swanson further discloses wherein the enterprise is a healthcare provider (col. 7, lines 39-53).

As to claim 49, Swanson further discloses an automated interface for catching message and redirecting the messages to the ancillary system data transfer mechanism (col. 5, lines 1-5).

As to claims 51 and 52, Swanson teaches the method recited in claim 10, wherein the caught message was generated spontaneously by the message-generating ancillary system (col. 58, lines 38-42).

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is at 571-272-4041 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at 571-272-4107.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

(571) –273-8300 [Official Communication]

BQ To

September 16th, 2006



DEBBIE LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/18/06